

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program* *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

---

|                       |   |                            |              |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Applicant</b>      | Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District                                | <b>Amount Requested</b>    | \$ 3,109,856 |
| <b>Proposal Title</b> | 2013 Hannah Ranch Flood Control & Habitat Conservation Project Proposal | <b>Total Proposal Cost</b> | \$ 6,219,712 |

---

#### PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in northeastern Tulare County, between Terminus Dam and downstream communities. The project will develop a 1,500 acre feet flood basin designed to conserve and reregulate floodwater for beneficial use. Project construction efforts will include earthen basins built below grade on approximately 380 acres currently owned by KDWCD, restored and conserved habitat area for endangered species, new diversion structures from the Lower Kaweah River (LKR) and the Friant-Kern Canal (FKC), and a curtain wall and french drain system around three sides of the property to protect adjacent landowners from impacts related to elevated groundwater levels.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

| Criteria   | Score/<br>Max. Possible | Criteria                   | Score/<br>Max. Possible |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Work Plan  | 9/15                    | Technical Justification    | 6/10                    |
| Budget   | 5/5                     |                            |                         |
| Schedule   | 4/5                     | Benefits and Cost Analysis | 21/30                   |
| Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures | 3/5                     | Program Preferences        | 3/10                    |
| Total Score (max. possible = 80)                 |                         |                            | 51                      |

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, the applicant states the goals and objectives of the IRWMP and the region, but does not clearly describe the goals and objectives of the project. In addition, Task 6 – Environmental Documentation does not include work items associated with environmental documentation. It appears the applicant copy/pasted the Final Design task into the Environmental

Documentation section. As a result, the work plan does not address how the applicant will complete their CEQA/NEPA process.

## **BUDGET**

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. An overall summary budget was provided for the proposal. In addition, the tasks detailed in the budget are consistent with the tasks included in the work plan and schedule. The costs associated with the tasks are reasonable and supported by documentation in the form of contractor estimates and staff hour and hourly rate. Lastly, the budget contains a narrative section that offers tables and explanations for how the costs were estimated.

## **SCHEDULE**

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget. The applicant claims that construction will begin November 2013, but notes that, “construction of the Friant-Kern Canal Structure could be delayed to November, 2014 or November, 2015 if [the Friant Water Authority] chooses not to conduct said maintenance and dewatering activities, however, FWA is required to perform these activities every three (3) years at a minimum.” Given this information and the 10% level of the plans and specs, the applicant does not demonstrate certainty that construction will begin before October 2014.

## **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The provided targets are more representative of goals and are not measureable ways to monitor project performance. For example, the applicant includes the goal of “minimize flooding damage by impounding some floodwaters”, with a target of “supplemental flood damage reduction.” Without measurable targets, it cannot be determined when project goals are met.

## **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. For example, starting on page 75, the applicant explains that the area and depth of flooding was assumed for this analysis, due to lack of time to prepare a detailed flood model or present adequate data. Furthermore, the applicant does not adequately support how the proposal would expand the Kaweah River Power Authorities ability to generate on-peak hydroelectric power at Terminus Dam.

## **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Total project cost is shown as \$9.53 million in present value (PV) in Table 17 (on page 96). This value is substantially higher than the construction cost estimate shown in the budget attachment (Table 5 shows \$6.2 million). Table 17 footnote references Table 16 where the total PV of cost is shown as \$6.595 million. None of the cost estimates include an opportunity cost for land.

Annual benefit (reduction of estimated annual damage (EAD) with the project) was \$3.26 million. This results in flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits of \$17.3 million in PV. However, the flood inundation area, frequency, inundation depths, and structures affected are questionable. The applicant used default values for all structural

damage in FRAM, and provided no evidence that its default construction and replacement values were a reasonable representation for the project area.

Additional monetized benefits were estimated for the value of water supply provided. From the State perspective it was not demonstrated that this water supply represents new water supply to the state (i.e., that it would not have been used or percolated to groundwater downstream in absence of this project). Additional non-monetized benefits are described, including public health and safety and wildlife habitat.

## **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims that 2 program preferences and 8 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for only 3 of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Drought Preparedness; and (3) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. The applicant only supplies a narrative for four Preferences. A table is also provided, with copy and pasted IRWM Guideline descriptions of each Statewide Priority where certain words have been underlined. Table also includes nondescript statements, but no detail as to how the project will achieve the priority. As a result, the applicant fails to demonstrate, to a high degree of certainty, that the proposal will implement most of the preferences claimed.